arXiv:1210.2581v1 [hep-ph] 9 Oct 2012

Wilson lines and orbital angular momentum

Cédric Lorcé

IPNO, Université Paris-Sud, CNRS/IN2P3, 91406 Orsay, France

and LPT, Université Paris-Sud, CNRS, 91406 Orsay, France

Abstract

We present an explicit realization of the Chen *et al.* approach to the proton spin decomposition in terms of Wilson lines, generalizing the light-front gauge-invariant extensions discussed recently by Hatta. Particular attention is drawn to the residual gauge freedom by further separating the pure-gauge term into contour and residual terms. Contrarily to a recent claim, we show that the Wigner distributions do not give access to the kinetic orbital angular momentum. Finally, we confirm from twist-2 arguments that the advanced, retarded and antisymmetric light-front canonical orbital angular momenta are the same.

PACS numbers:

I. INTRODUCTION

In the last few years, the debates about which decomposition of the proton spin is physically acceptable were revived by the possibility of rendering the Jaffe-Manohar or canonical decomposition gauge invariant. Moreover, it has been shown that one can access the canonical orbital angular momentum provided that one is able to extract experimentally either the Wigner distributions or particular twist-3 distributions. For a recent review of the discussions, see Ref. [1].

This work addresses the issues of explicit definition, uniqueness and measurability of the canonical decomposition from a geometrical perspective. In section II, we first recall the suggestion made by Chen *et al.* to separate the gauge field into pure-gauge and physical terms. Although gauge invariant, this approach is not unique owing to the Stueckelberg symmetry which reflects the freedom in defining what is exactly meant by pure-gauge and physical contributions. In section III, we present a generic realization of the Chen *et al.* approach based on the idea of parallel transport from a reference point. We show in particular that a change of reference point and/or geodesic amounts to a Stueckelberg transformation. We discuss with special care in section IV the partial gauge fixing and the residual gauge freedom which motivate a further decomposition of the pure-gauge term into contour and residual terms. In section V, we show that the Wigner operator is related to the canonical momentum operator. We conclude that, contrarily to a recent claim, the Wigner operator involving direct Wilson lines does not give access to the kinetic orbital angular momentum. Choosing Wilson lines running along the light-front direction, we recover in section VI the light-front gauge-invariant extensions of the canonical angular momentum discussed in the literature, albeit with a more transparent treatment of the residual gauge freedom. Then we show from twist-2 arguments that the advanced, retarded and antisymmetric light-front canonical orbital angular momenta are the same, confirming a previous approach based on the twist-3 level. Finally, we gather our conclusions in section VII.

II. CHEN *ET AL.* DECOMPOSITION

In order to unambiguously define what is meant by gluon spin and orbital angular momentum, Chen *et al.* proposed to split the gauge field into a pure-gauge term and a physical term [2–5]

$$A_\mu(x) = A^{\text{pure}}_\mu(x) + A^{\text{phys}}_\mu(x) \tag{1}$$

satisfying specific gauge transformation laws

$$A^{\text{pure}}_\mu(x) \mapsto \tilde{A}^{\text{pure}}_\mu(x) = U(x)\left[A^{\text{pure}}_\mu(x) + \frac{i}{g}\,\partial_\mu\right]U^{-1}(x), \tag{2}$$

$$A^{\text{phys}}_\mu(x) \mapsto \tilde{A}^{\text{phys}}_\mu(x) = U(x)A^{\text{phys}}_\mu(x)U^{-1}(x). \tag{3}$$

Since $A^{\text{pure}}_\mu(x)$ is a pure gauge, it can be written as

$$A^{\text{pure}}_\mu(x) = \frac{i}{g}\,U_{\text{pure}}(x)\partial_\mu U^{-1}_{\text{pure}}(x), \tag{4}$$

where $U_{\text{pure}}(x)$ is some unitary gauge matrix with the gauge transformation law

$$U_{\text{pure}}(x) \mapsto \tilde{U}_{\text{pure}}(x) = U(x)U_{\text{pure}}(x). \tag{5}$$

Clearly, in the gauge $U(x) = U^{-1}_{\text{pure}}(x)$ the pure-gauge term vanishes.

By construction, the decomposition (1) is gauge invariant. However, it is not unique since we still have some freedom in defining exactly what we mean by 'pure-gauge' and 'physical'. The reason is that the pure-gauge and physical terms remain respectively pure-gauge and physical under the following transformation which leaves $A_\mu(x)$ invariant

$$A^{\text{pure}}_\mu(x) \mapsto A^{\text{pure},g}_\mu(x) = A^{\text{pure}}_\mu(x) + \frac{i}{g}\,U_{\text{pure}}(x)U_0^{-1}(x)\left[\partial_\mu U_0(x)\right]U^{-1}_{\text{pure}}(x), \tag{6}$$

$$A^{\text{phys}}_\mu(x) \mapsto A^{\text{phys},g}_\mu(x) = A^{\text{phys}}_\mu(x) - \frac{i}{g}\,U_{\text{pure}}(x)U_0^{-1}(x)\left[\partial_\mu U_0(x)\right]U^{-1}_{\text{pure}}(x), \tag{7}$$

where $U_0(x)$ is a gauge-invariant unitary matrix. Because of the similarity between the Chen *et al.* approach and the Stueckelberg mechanism [1], we refer to this transformation as the Stueckelberg (gauge) transformation.

III. EXPLICIT CONSTRUCTION USING WILSON LINES

In this section, we present an explicit construction of the Chen *et al.* decomposition based on the idea of parallel transport. In general relativity the fiber, *i.e.* the vector space attached to each point x, is the tangent space which inherits automatically a natural basis. Fixing some point and some tangent vector at that point, the parallel transport equation can then be used to define a unique curve called the geodesic. In gauge theories, the fiber is an internal space with *a priori* no natural basis. The parallel transport equation can then be used to define such a natural basis away from some reference point, provided that one identifies the geodesics with a family of standard contours [6, 7]. Clearly, the natural basis will generally depend on our choice for the standard contour. The most important constraints are the absence of self-intersection in the standard contour, and the existence of a standard contour for any point.

Consider some reference point x_r. Once a basis is fixed in the internal space at x_r, we can parallel transport $U_{\text{pure}}(x_r)$ to any other point x along a standard contour $\mathcal{C}$ parametrized by the path $s(\lambda)$, and therefore define a unique $U_{\text{pure}}(x)$. As usual, the parallel transport equation expresses the fact that the covariant derivative along the path has to vanish

$$\frac{\partial s^\mu}{\partial\lambda}\, D_\mu U_{\text{pure}}(s(\lambda)) = 0, \tag{8}$$

where $D_\mu = \partial_\mu - igA_\mu(s(\lambda))$ is the covariant derivative. The solution to this equation involves the well-known Wilson line

$$\begin{aligned} U_{\text{pure}}(x) &= \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{C}}(x, x_r)\, U_{\text{pure}}(x_r), && (9)\\ \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{C}}(x, x_r) &= \mathcal{P}\left[e^{ig\int_{x_r}^{x} A_\mu(s)\,\mathrm{d}s^\mu}\right] \\ &= \mathbb{1} + ig\int_{x_r}^{x} A_\mu(s)\,\mathrm{d}s^\mu + (ig)^2\int_{x_r}^{x}\int_{x_r}^{s_1} A_\mu(s_1)A_\nu(s_2)\,\mathrm{d}s_1^\mu\,\mathrm{d}s_2^\nu + \cdots . && (10) \end{aligned}$$

Using now the formula for the derivative of the Wilson line

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial z^\mu}\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{C}}(x, y) = ig\,\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{C}}(x, s)\, A_\alpha(s)\,\frac{\partial s^\alpha}{\partial z^\mu}\,\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{C}}(s, y)\Big|_{s=y}^{s=x} \\ + ig\int_{y}^{x}\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{C}}(x, s)\, F_{\alpha\beta}(s)\,\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{C}}(s, y)\,\frac{\partial s^\alpha}{\partial z^\mu}\,\mathrm{d}s^\beta, \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

where $F_{\alpha\beta} = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu - ig\,[A_\mu, A_\nu]$ is the field-strength tensor, and the fact that the inverse of the Wilson line is simply obtained by an interchange of the end points $\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{C}}^{-1}(x, y) = \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{C}}(y, x)$, we arrive at the following explicit expressions for the pure-gauge and physical parts of the gauge field

$$A_\mu^{\text{pure}}(x) = \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{C}}(x, x_r)\left[\frac{\partial x_r^\alpha}{\partial x^\mu}\, A_\alpha^{\text{pure}}(x_r) + \frac{i}{g}\,\frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu}\right]\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{C}}(x_r, x), \tag{12}$$

$$\begin{aligned} A_\mu^{\text{phys}}(x) = \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{C}}(x, x_r)\,\frac{\partial x_r^\alpha}{\partial x^\mu}\, A_\alpha^{\text{phys}}(x_r)\,\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{C}}(x_r, x) \\ - \int_{x_r}^{x}\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{C}}(x, s)\, F_{\alpha\beta}(s)\,\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{C}}(s, x)\,\frac{\partial s^\alpha}{\partial x^\mu}\,\mathrm{d}s^\beta. \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

Eqs. (12) and (13) are nothing but the parallel transport of $A^{\text{pure}}_\mu(x_r)$ and $A^{\text{phys}}_\mu(x_r)$ to the point x. Using the gauge transformation law of the Wilson line

$$\mathcal{W}_\mathcal{C}(x,y)\mapsto\tilde{\mathcal{W}}_\mathcal{C}(x,y)=U(x)\,\mathcal{W}_\mathcal{C}(x,y)\,U^{-1}(y),\tag{14}$$

it is straightforward to check that the pure-gauge and physical terms in Eqs. (12) and (13) transform according to Eqs. (2) and (3), respectively.

Since all the points belonging to a standard contour have the same reference point $\frac{\partial x^\alpha_r}{\partial\lambda}=0$, the physical part of the gauge potential is orthogonal to the contour

$$\frac{\partial s^\mu}{\partial\lambda}\,A^{\text{phys}}_\mu(s(\lambda))=0,\qquad\frac{\partial s^\mu}{\partial\lambda}\,A_\mu(s(\lambda))=\frac{\partial s^\mu}{\partial\lambda}\,A^{\text{pure}}_\mu(s(\lambda)).\tag{15}$$

In other words, the component of the gauge field tangent to the path is considered to be a pure gauge. This clearly shows how the choice of a standard contour affects the separation of the gauge field into pure-gauge and physical terms. By simply changing the contour and possibly the reference point, we change what we mean by pure-gauge and physical terms, *i.e.* such a change amounts to performing a Stueckelberg transformation. It is easy to relate different choices of contour and reference point. Indeed, denoting the fields obtained with a different contour $\mathcal{C}'$ and possibly different reference point x'_r with a superscript g, we can write

$$U^g_{\text{pure}}(x)=U_{\text{pure}}(x)\,U^{-1}_0(x),\tag{16}$$

where $U_0(x)=U^{g,-1}_{\text{pure}}(x'_r)\,\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{C}'}(x'_r,x)\,\mathcal{W}_\mathcal{C}(x,x_r)\,U_{\text{pure}}(x_r)$ is obviously unitary and gauge invariant. Eq. (16) is then nothing but the Stueckelberg transformation at the level of the $U_{\text{pure}}(x)$ matrices leading to Eqs. (6) and (7).

IV. CONTOUR, RESIDUAL AND NATURAL GAUGES

The contour gauge corresponds to the gauge where the Wilson line reduces to the identity matrix for any x. This amounts to taking $U(x)=\mathcal{W}_\mathcal{C}(x_r,x)$. Contour gauges are particularly interesting because they were shown to be ghost-free [6]. Denoting the fields in the contour gauge with a superscript $\mathcal{C}$, we have

$$A^{\text{pure},\mathcal{C}}_\mu(x)=\frac{\partial x^\alpha_r}{\partial x^\mu}\,A^{\text{pure}}_\alpha(x_r),\tag{17}$$

$$A^{\text{phys},\mathcal{C}}_\mu(x)=\frac{\partial x^\alpha_r}{\partial x^\mu}\,A^{\text{phys}}_\alpha(x_r)-\int_{x_r}^x F^\mathcal{C}_{\alpha\beta}(s)\,\frac{\partial s^\alpha}{\partial x^\mu}\,\mathrm{d}s^\beta.\tag{18}$$

Note in particular that $A^{\mathcal{C}}_\mu(x_r)=A_\mu(x_r)$. The reason for this is simply that we used the point x_r as a reference, and so the original field and the field in the contour gauge should coincide at that point.

In general, the reference point x_r depends on x. Gauge transformations depending only implicitly on x through x_r will then leave the Wilson line in the contour gauge $\mathcal{W}^{\mathcal{C}}_{\mathcal{C}}(x,x_r)$ invariant

$$\mathbb{1}=\mathcal{W}^{\mathcal{C}}_{\mathcal{C}}(x,x_r)\mapsto\tilde{\mathcal{W}}^{\mathcal{C}}_{\mathcal{C}}(x,x_r)=U(x_r)\mathcal{W}^{\mathcal{C}}_{\mathcal{C}}(x,x_r)U^{-1}(x_r)=\mathbb{1}. \tag{19}$$

This remaining arbitrariness is nothing but the residual gauge symmetry

$$A^{\text{pure},\mathcal{C}}_\mu(x)\mapsto\tilde{A}^{\text{pure},\mathcal{C}}_\mu(x)=U(x_r)\left[A^{\text{pure},\mathcal{C}}_\mu(x)+\frac{i}{g}\frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu}\right]U^{-1}(x_r), \tag{20}$$

$$A^{\text{phys},\mathcal{C}}_\mu(x)\mapsto\tilde{A}^{\text{phys},\mathcal{C}}_\mu(x)=U(x_r)\,A^{\text{phys},\mathcal{C}}_\mu(x)\,U^{-1}(x_r). \tag{21}$$

It seems therefore natural to split further the pure-gauge term as follows

$$A^{\text{pure}}_\mu(x)=A^{\text{con}}_\mu(x)+A^{\text{res}}_\mu(x), \tag{22}$$

where the contour and residual terms are defined as

$$A^{\text{con}}_\mu(x)=\frac{i}{g}\,\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{C}}(x,x_r)\,\frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu}\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{C}}(x_r,x), \tag{23}$$

$$A^{\text{res}}_\mu(x)=\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{C}}(x,x_r)\,\frac{\partial x^\alpha_r}{\partial x^\mu}\,A^{\text{pure}}_\alpha(x_r)\,\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{C}}(x_r,x). \tag{24}$$

Their gauge transformation laws can easily be derived from Eq. (14)

$$\begin{aligned}A^{\text{con}}_\mu(x)\mapsto\tilde{A}^{\text{con}}_\mu(x)&=U(x)\left[A^{\text{con}}_\mu(x)+\frac{i}{g}\,\partial_\mu\right]U^{-1}(x)\\&\quad+\frac{i}{g}\,U(x)\,\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{C}}(x,x_r)\,U^{-1}(x_r)\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu}U(x_r)\right]\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{C}}(x_r,x)\,U^{-1}(x),\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

$$\begin{aligned}A^{\text{res}}_\mu(x)\mapsto\tilde{A}^{\text{res}}_\mu(x)&=U(x)\,A^{\text{res}}_\mu(x)U^{-1}(x)\\&\quad-\frac{i}{g}\,U(x)\,\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{C}}(x,x_r)\,U^{-1}(x_r)\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu}U(x_r)\right]\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{C}}(x_r,x)\,U^{-1}(x).\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

Clearly, in the contour gauge, the contour term vanishes $A^{\text{con},\mathcal{C}}_\mu(x)=0$ and is invariant under residual gauge transformations, so that the pure-gauge term simply reduces to the residual term $A^{\text{pure},\mathcal{C}}_\mu(x)=A^{\text{res},\mathcal{C}}_\mu(x)$. Note also that in order to define the physical part of the gauge potential at a point x, we need to know what is the physical part at the reference point

x_r. It is therefore more natural to consider the sum of physical and residual parts, as its definition involves solely the full gauge field $A_\mu(x)$

$$\begin{aligned} A^{\text{res}}_\mu(x) + A^{\text{phys}}_\mu(x) = \mathcal{W}_\mathcal{C}(x,x_r)\,\frac{\partial x_r^\alpha}{\partial x^\mu}\,A_\mu(x_r)\,\mathcal{W}_\mathcal{C}(x_r,x)& \\ -\int_{x_r}^{x}\mathcal{W}_\mathcal{C}(x,s)\,F_{\alpha\beta}(s)\,\mathcal{W}_\mathcal{C}(s,x)\,\frac{\partial s^\alpha}{\partial x^\mu}\,\mathrm{d}s^\beta.& \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

In the literature, this sum is sometimes also referred to as $A^{\text{phys}}_\mu(x)$, introducing some confusion in what is meant by physical. Strictly speaking, even though the sum $A^{\text{res}}_\mu(x)+A^{\text{phys}}_\mu(x)$ is orthogonal to the contour, it does not transform covariantly under gauge transformations (3), and should not be considered as a genuine physical part.

As discussed in Ref. [1], the natural gauge is the gauge where the pure-gauge term vanishes, and corresponds to taking $U(x) = U^{-1}_{\text{pure}}(x)$. Equivalently, we can start with the fields in the contour gauge and perform a residual gauge transformation with $U(x_r) = U^{-1}_{\text{pure}}(x_r)$. Denoting the fields in the natural gauge with a hat, we obtain

$$\hat{A}^{\text{pure}}_\mu(x) = \hat{A}^{\text{con}}_\mu(x) = \hat{A}^{\text{res}}_\mu(x) = 0, \tag{28}$$

$$\hat{A}^{\text{phys}}_\mu(x) = \frac{\partial x_r^\alpha}{\partial x^\mu}\,\hat{A}_\alpha(x_r) - \int_{x_r}^{x}\hat{F}_{\alpha\beta}(s)\,\frac{\partial s^\alpha}{\partial x^\mu}\,\mathrm{d}s^\beta. \tag{29}$$

In practice, one would often assume that all the standard contours start at the same fixed point x_0 where only global (*i.e.* x-independent) gauge transformations are allowed. Choosing this fixed point as the reference point $x_r = x_0$, one avoids dealing with the residual gauge symmetry

$$U_{\text{pure}}(x) = \mathcal{W}_\mathcal{C}(x,x_0)U_{\text{pure}}(x_0), \tag{30}$$

$$A^{\text{pure}}_\mu(x) = \frac{i}{g}\,\mathcal{W}_\mathcal{C}(x,x_0)\,\frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu}\mathcal{W}_\mathcal{C}(x_0,x), \tag{31}$$

$$A^{\text{phys}}_\mu(x) = \frac{\partial x_0^\alpha}{\partial x^\mu}\,A_\alpha(x_0) - \int_{x_0}^{x}\mathcal{W}_\mathcal{C}(x,s)\,F_{\alpha\beta}(s)\,\mathcal{W}_\mathcal{C}(s,x)\,\frac{\partial s^\alpha}{\partial x^\mu}\,\mathrm{d}s^\beta, \tag{32}$$

and so the contour gauge simply coincides with the natural gauge up to a global gauge transformation. Consider now that the reference point is some intermediate point on the path from x_0 to x. We can decompose the parallel transport from x_0 to x as a parallel transport from x_0 to x_r, followed by a parallel transport from x_r to x

$$\mathcal{W}_\mathcal{C}(x,x_0) = \mathcal{W}_\mathcal{C}(x,x_r)\,\mathcal{W}_\mathcal{C}(x_r,x_0). \tag{33}$$

The parallel transport from x_0 to x_r defines what is the pure-gauge term at x_r. Choosing x_r as the reference point leads to the identification of the pure-gauge term at x_r with the residual term $A^{\text{pure}}_\mu(x_r) = A^{\text{res}}_\mu(x_r)$. The parallel transport from x_r to x then defines what is the contour term. In short, the parallel transport from x_0 defines what is the pure-gauge term, while the parallel transport from x_r determines the separation of the pure-gauge term into contour and residual terms.

V. ORBITAL ANGULAR MOMENTUM IN PHASE SPACE

Since the orbital angular momentum (OAM) corresponds to a correlation between position and momentum, it is most easily discussed from a phase-space perspective. In this section, we restrict ourselves to the quark sector, but the discussion can easily be transposed to the gluon sector. We first remind the two main kinds of OAM and the definition of the gauge-invariant Wigner or phase-space operator. We then show how this Wigner operator is related to the OAM.

A. Kinetic and canonical orbital angular momentum

There exist essentially two kinds of gauge-invariant orbital angular momentum. One is the *kinetic* OAM [8]

$$\mathcal{M}^{\mu\nu\rho}_{q,\text{OAM}}(x) = \frac{i}{2}\,\overline{\psi}(x)\gamma^\mu x^{[\nu}\overset{\leftrightarrow}{D}{}^{\rho]}(x)\psi(x) \tag{34}$$

and the other one is the *canonical* OAM [2, 3]

$$\mathsf{M}^{\mu\nu\rho}_{q,\text{OAM}}(x) = \frac{i}{2}\,\overline{\psi}(x)\gamma^\mu x^{[\nu}\overset{\leftrightarrow}{D}{}^{\rho]}_{\text{pure}}(x)\psi(x), \tag{35}$$

where the covariant derivatives at the point x are defined as $D^\mu(x) = \partial^\mu - igA^\mu(x)$ and $D^\mu_{\text{pure}}(x) = \partial^\mu - igA^\mu_{\text{pure}}(x)$. We used for convenience the notations $a^{[\mu}b^{\nu]} = a^\mu b^\nu - a^\nu b^\mu$ and $\overset{\leftrightarrow}{\partial} = \overset{\rightarrow}{\partial} - \overset{\leftarrow}{\partial}$. These two OAMs differ by a so-called potential term [4, 5]

$$\mathsf{M}^{\mu\nu\rho}_{\text{pot}}(x) = -g\,\overline{\psi}(x)\gamma^\mu x^{[\nu}A^{\rho]}_{\text{phys}}(x)\psi(x), \tag{36}$$

which is usually non-vanishing. In the natural gauge, the canonical OAM reduces to the same expression as in the definition of the Jaffe-Manohar OAM [9]

$$\hat{\mathsf{M}}^{\mu\nu\rho}_{q,\text{spin}}(x) = \frac{i}{2}\,\overline{\hat{\psi}}(x)\gamma^\mu x^{[\nu}\overset{\leftrightarrow}{\partial}{}^{\rho]}\hat{\psi}(x), \tag{37}$$

and can then be thought of as a gauge-invariant extension (GIE) of the latter [10, 11].

Contrarily to the kinetic OAM, the canonical OAM is not Stueckelberg invariant[1], *i.e.* it depends on how one explicitly separates the gauge field into pure-gauge and physical terms. There is consequently an infinite number of possible different definitions of canonical OAM, all sharing the same formal structure (35). The reduction to the Jaffe-Manohar OAM occurs in different gauges, implying that the different canonical OAMs are not equivalent.

B. Wigner operator

The gauge-invariant quark Wigner operator is defined as [12, 13]

$$\widehat{W}^{[\gamma^\mu]q}(x,k) \equiv \int \frac{\mathrm{d}^4 z}{(2\pi)^4}\, e^{ik\cdot z}\, \overline{\psi}(x-\tfrac{z}{2})\gamma^\mu\, \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{C}}(x-\tfrac{z}{2}, x+\tfrac{z}{2})\, \psi(x+\tfrac{z}{2}). \tag{38}$$

It can be interpreted as a phase-space density operator. For example, the first and second k^μ-moments of the Wigner operator respectively give the density and canonical momentum density operators in coordinate space

$$\int \mathrm{d}^4 k\, \widehat{W}^{[\gamma^\mu]q}(x,k) = \overline{\psi}(x)\gamma^\mu\psi(x), \tag{39}$$

$$\int \mathrm{d}^4 k\, k^\rho\, \widehat{W}^{[\gamma^\mu]q}(x,k) = \frac{i}{2}\,\overline{\psi}(x)\gamma^\mu \overset{\leftrightarrow}{D}{}^\rho_{\text{pure}}(x)\psi(x). \tag{40}$$

The first moment is trivially obtained, while the second requires some care. We sketch here its derivation. We first assume that the Wilson line appearing in the definition of the Wigner operator is composed of standard paths, and that there exists a fixed reference point x_0. Integrating by parts and using the fact that x and z are independent variables, we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int \mathrm{d}^4 k\, k^\rho\, \widehat{W}^{[\gamma^\mu]q}(x,k) \\
&\qquad = i\int \mathrm{d}^4 k\, \frac{\mathrm{d}^4 z}{(2\pi)^4}\, e^{ik\cdot z}\, \partial^\rho_z \left[\overline{\psi}(x-\tfrac{z}{2})\gamma^\mu\, \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{C}}(x-\tfrac{z}{2}, x+\tfrac{z}{2})\, \psi(x+\tfrac{z}{2})\right] \\
&\qquad = \frac{i}{2}\int \mathrm{d}^4 k\, \frac{\mathrm{d}^4 z}{(2\pi)^4}\, e^{ik\cdot z}\, \overline{\psi}(x-\tfrac{z}{2})\gamma^\mu\, \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{C}}(x-\tfrac{z}{2}, x_0)\overset{\leftrightarrow}{\partial}{}^\rho_x \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{C}}(x_0, x+\tfrac{z}{2})\, \psi(x+\tfrac{z}{2}).
\end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

From the definition (31) for $A^\mu_{\text{pure}}(x)$, we obtain

$$\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{C}}(x-\tfrac{z}{2}, x_0)\overset{\leftrightarrow}{\partial}{}^\rho_x \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{C}}(x_0, x+\tfrac{z}{2}) = \mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{C}}(x-\tfrac{z}{2}, x)\overset{\leftrightarrow}{D}{}^\rho_{\text{pure}}(x)\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{C}}(x, x+\tfrac{z}{2}). \tag{42}$$

---

[1] In the gluon sector, only the total (*i.e.* spin+OAM) kinetic angular momentum is Stueckelberg invariant.

Inserting now this expression in Eq. (41) and performing the integrations, we arrive at the result (40). It is therefore natural to interpret the variable k^μ appearing in the definition of the Wigner operator as the (average) canonical momentum.

Is it possible to define a Wigner operator where the variable k^μ would be interpreted as the (average) kinetic momentum? Consider a generic differential operator $\overleftrightarrow{\mathcal{D}}^\rho(x)$ defined at some point x. There exist two natural non-local generalizations of such an operator

$$\overleftrightarrow{\mathcal{D}}^\rho_m(x-\tfrac{z}{2},x+\tfrac{z}{2}) \equiv \mathcal{W}_\mathcal{C}(x-\tfrac{z}{2},x)\,\overleftrightarrow{\mathcal{D}}^\rho(x)\mathcal{W}_\mathcal{C}(x,x+\tfrac{z}{2}), \tag{43}$$

$$\overleftrightarrow{\mathcal{D}}^\rho_e(x-\tfrac{z}{2},x+\tfrac{z}{2}) \equiv \mathcal{W}_\mathcal{C}(x-\tfrac{z}{2},x+\tfrac{z}{2})\,\overrightarrow{\mathcal{D}}^\rho(x+\tfrac{z}{2})-\overleftarrow{\mathcal{D}}^\rho(x-\tfrac{z}{2})\mathcal{W}_\mathcal{C}(x-\tfrac{z}{2},x+\tfrac{z}{2}), \tag{44}$$

referred to as the mid- and endpoint non-local differential operators, respectively. Using once again Eq. (31), it is easy to see that the mid- and endpoint non-local pure-gauge covariant derivatives are equivalent $\overleftrightarrow{D}^\rho_{\text{pure},m}(x-\frac{z}{2},x+\frac{z}{2})=\overleftrightarrow{D}^\rho_{\text{pure},e}(x-\frac{z}{2},x+\frac{z}{2})$. It is therefore possible to unambiguously define a canonical momentum associated with a non-local operator. On the contrary, the mid- and endpoint non-local ordinary covariant derivatives differ

$$\begin{aligned}\overleftrightarrow{D}^\rho_m(x-\tfrac{z}{2},x+\tfrac{z}{2})-&\overleftrightarrow{D}^\rho_e(x-\tfrac{z}{2},x+\tfrac{z}{2})\\ &=-ig\sum_{\eta=\pm}\int_x^{x+\eta\frac{z}{2}}\mathcal{W}_\mathcal{C}(x-\tfrac{z}{2},s)\,F_{\alpha\beta}(s)\,\mathcal{W}_\mathcal{C}(s,x+\tfrac{z}{2})\,\frac{\partial s^\alpha}{\partial x_\rho}\,\mathrm{d}s^\beta.\end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

because of the field-strength tensor, *i.e.* the curvature. No unique kinetic momentum can be associated with a non-local operator. We therefore expect that there exists no Wigner operator where the variable k^μ can be interpreted as the (average) kinetic momentum.

C. Orbital angular momentum

Having at our disposal the Wigner operator, we can simply rewrite the canonical OAM density as follows [14, 15]

$$\mathsf{M}^{\mu\nu\rho}_{q,\text{OAM}}(x)=\int\mathrm{d}^4k\,x^{[\nu}k^{\rho]}\,W^{[\gamma^\mu]q}(x,k). \tag{46}$$

The integrand has the familar structure of an OAM weighted by a phase-space density. It seems therefore natural to interpret it directly as a density of canonical OAM in phase space. The (longitudinal) canonical OAM is defined as usual by the following matrix element

$$\mathsf{L}_q=\tfrac{1}{2}\,\epsilon^{ij}\,\langle P,\Lambda|\int\mathrm{d}^4x\,\delta(x^+)\,\mathsf{M}^{+ij}_{q,\text{OAM}}(x)|P,\Lambda\rangle/\langle P,\Lambda|P,\Lambda\rangle, \tag{47}$$

where $a^\pm = (a^0 \pm a^3)/\sqrt{2}$ and $a^i = a^{1,2}$ are the light-front and transverse components, respectively. The proton state with momentum P and light-front helicity Λ is normalized as $\langle P, \Lambda | P, \Lambda \rangle = 2P^+(2\pi)^3\,\delta(0^+)\,\delta^{(2)}(\vec{0}_\perp)$. The kinetic OAM is defined likewise.

In Refs. [10, 11], the authors claim that the kinetic OAM can be obtained from the Wigner operator when the Wilson line consists in a direct straight line between the endpoints. This claim is in contradiction with our conclusion which holds for rather general Wilson lines, including in particular the direct straight line. Unfortunately, the authors of Refs. [10, 11] do not provide any detail concerning the derivation of their formula. Note that, working in the x-based Fock-Schwinger gauge $z \cdot A(x + z) = 0$ where the direct straight Wilson lines reduce to unity, we do not see how a covariant derivative can arise. We remind that it is only for the component along the path that the ordinary and pure-gauge covariant derivatives coincide $z \cdot D(x+z) = z \cdot D_{\text{pure}}(x+z)$. When considering the OAM density operator at some point x, one has to integrate over z so that the z-direction is usually not orthogonal to x. We therefore need the pure-gauge and not the ordinary covariant derivative. In conclusion, the OAM defined in terms of the Wigner operator with the direct straight Wilson line is simply the GIE of the Jaffe-Manohar OAM defined in the Fock-Schwinger gauge, and has no relation with the kinetic OAM.

VI. LIGHT-FRONT GAUGE-INVARIANT EXTENSIONS

Since the proton spin structure is best probed in high-energy experiments where a parton model is very useful and convenient, it appears that the light-front GIEs, characterized by the contour gauge $A^+ = 0$, are the most relevant ones. The light-front gauge does not completely fix the gauge freedom, and so in order to define a unique GIE one has to specify also how to fix the residual gauge freedom, typically by imposing boundary conditions. The most popular ones are the advanced (+), retarded (−) and antisymmetric (as) boundary conditions. The canonical OAMs defined in the corresponding light-front GIEs are *a priori* different. It appears however that, because of the time-reversal invariance, they actually coincide. These light-front GIEs have been developed and discussed by Hatta in Refs. [16, 17]. In the light-front gauge, they simply reduce to the Bashinsky-Jaffe decomposition [18]. The general formalism developed in this paper completes these discussions by treating with greater care the residual gauge freedom and by clarifying some of the arguments.

The advanced and retarded light-front GIEs are typical examples of the contour approach. They are obtained by considering Wilson lines running along the light-front direction to $+\infty^-$ and $-\infty^-$, respectively, where the field is assumed to be a pure gauge. The light-front and transverse components of the different contributions to the gauge field are then given by

$$A^+_{\text{con},\pm}(x) = A^+(x), \tag{48}$$

$$A^+_{\text{res},\pm}(x) = A^+_{\text{phys},\pm}(x) = 0, \tag{49}$$

$$A^i_{\text{con},\pm}(x) = \frac{i}{g}\,\mathcal{W}_{LF}(x^-,\pm\infty^-)\,\partial^i\mathcal{W}_{LF}(\pm\infty^-,x^-), \tag{50}$$

$$A^i_{\text{res},\pm}(x) = \mathcal{W}_{LF}(x^-,\pm\infty^-)\,A^i(\pm\infty^-,\boldsymbol{x})\,\mathcal{W}_{LF}(\pm\infty^-,x^-), \tag{51}$$

$$A^i_{\text{phys},\pm}(x) = \int_{\pm\infty^-}^{x^-}\mathcal{W}_{LF}(x^-,y^-)\,F^{+i}(y^-,\boldsymbol{x})\,\mathcal{W}_{LF}(y^-,x^-)\,\mathrm{d}y^-, \tag{52}$$

where we used the notation $\boldsymbol{x} = (x^+, x^1, x^2)$ and the light-front Wilson line

$$\mathcal{W}_{LF}(x^-,y^-) \equiv \mathcal{P}\left[e^{ig\int_{y^-}^{x^-}A^+(y^-,\boldsymbol{x})\,\mathrm{d}y^-}\right]. \tag{53}$$

On the contrary, the antisymmetric light-front GIE cannot be constructed from a single contour, but can be expressed as an average of the advanced and retarded light-front GIEs

$$A^\mu_{\cdots,as}(x) = \frac{A^\mu_{\cdots,+}(x) + A^\mu_{\cdots,-}(x)}{2}, \tag{54}$$

where the dots stand for 'con', 'res' and 'phys'.

Since the quark kinetic OAM $L_q = \mathsf{L}_q - \mathsf{L}_{\text{pot}}$ is Stueckelberg invariant, it is sufficient to show that either the quark canonical OAM L_q or the potential OAM L_{pot} is the same in the advanced and retarded light-front GIEs. While Refs. [11, 17, 19] considered the second option, we prefer the first option because it does not require to go beyond leading twist. As shown in Ref. [14], the matrix elements of the Wigner operator are related by Fourier transform to the following generalized parton correlator

$$\begin{aligned} &W^{[\Gamma]q}(x,\xi,\vec{k}_\perp,\vec{\Delta}_\perp;\eta) \\ &\qquad= \frac{1}{2}\int\frac{\mathrm{d}z^-\,\mathrm{d}^2z_\perp}{(2\pi)^3}\,e^{i(xP^+z^- - \vec{k}_\perp\cdot\vec{z}_\perp)}\,\langle p',\Lambda'|\overline{\psi}(-\tfrac{z}{2})\Gamma\mathcal{W}_{LF}(-\tfrac{z}{2},\tfrac{z}{2})\,\psi(\tfrac{z}{2})|p,\Lambda\rangle\Big|_{z^+=0}, \end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

where $\Delta = p' - p$ is the momentum transfer, $k^+ = xP^+$ and $\Delta^+ = -2\xi P^+$ with $P = (p'+p)/2$ the average nucleon momentum, and Γ is a Dirac matrix. The Wilson lines simply run along the light-front direction to $\eta\infty^-$ with $\eta = \pm$. This general correlator has been parametrized in Ref. [20] in terms of the so-called generalized transverse-momentum dependent parton distributions (GTMDs). In the vector sector restricted to the leading twist $\Gamma = \gamma^+$, it is parametrized as

$$W^{[\gamma^+]q} = \frac{1}{2M}\,\overline{u}(p',\Lambda')\left[F_{1,1} + \frac{i\sigma^{i+}k^i_\perp}{P^+}\,F_{1,2} + \frac{i\sigma^{i+}\Delta^i_\perp}{P^+}\,F_{1,3} + \frac{i\sigma^{ij}k^i_\perp\Delta^j_\perp}{M^2}\,F_{1,4}\right]u(p,\Lambda), \tag{56}$$

where the GTMDs are complex-valued functions of the variables $(x,\xi,\vec{k}^2_\perp,\vec{k}_\perp\cdot\vec{\Delta}_\perp,\vec{\Delta}^2_\perp;\eta)$.

The functions $F_{1,1-3}$ reduce to the usual generalized parton distributions (GPDs) and transverse-momentum dependent parton distributions (TMDs) in the appropriate limits. On the contrary, $F_{1,4}$ appears only at the level of the GTMDs. As shown in Refs. [14, 19], it is precisely this leading-twist function which is directly related to the canonical OAM

$$\mathsf{L}_q(\eta) = -\int \mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}^2k_\perp\,\frac{\vec{k}^2_\perp}{M^2}\,F^q_{1,4}(x,0,\vec{k}^2_\perp,0,0;\eta). \tag{57}$$

Now, time-reversal invariance implies that the real part of the GTMDs is η-even (*i.e.* independent of η), while the imaginary part is η-odd. The hermiticity constraint then imposes that the real part of $F^q_{1,4}$ is Δ-even, while the imaginary part is Δ-odd. Since in Eq. (57) the GTMD $F^q_{1,4}$ is evaluated at $\Delta = 0$, only its real part contributes. This ensures that the canonical OAM is real (as it should be) but also that it does not depend on η. In other words, the canonical OAM L_q defined from the advanced, retarded and antisymmetric light-front GIEs are the same. Similar arguments applied to twist-3 parton correlators show that the potential OAM L_{pot} is the same in the three light-front GIEs [11, 17, 19]. Note also some recent related discussions [21, 22] treating the path dependence in transverse-momentum dependent correlators.

VII. CONCLUSION

We presented an explicit realization of the Chen *et al.* decomposition of the gauge field into pure-gauge and physical terms. The construction involves Wilson lines and is based on the idea of parallel transport from a reference point. We showed in particular that a change of reference point and/or geodesic induces a change in the explicit separation which can be seen as a Stueckelberg transformation. Paying particular attention to the residual gauge freedom, we proposed a further decomposition of the pure-gauge term into contour and residual terms.

Then we showed that the momentum variable in the Wigner operator refers to the canonical momentum and not the kinetic momentum. We therefore argue that the orbital angular momentum obtained from the Wigner distributions defined with direct straight lines corresponds to the canonical orbital angular momentum in the Fock-Schwinger gauge. It has nothing to do with the kinetic orbital angular momentum, contrarily to what was recently claimed. Choosing the Wilson lines to run along the light-front direction, our explicit construction simply reduces to the light-front gauge-invariant extensions of the canonical angular momentum discussed in the literature, albeit with a more transparent treatment of the residual gauge freedom. Finally, we showed from twist-2 arguments that the advanced, retarded and antisymmetric light-front canonical orbital angular momenta are the same, confirming the conclusions obtained previously from a twist-3 approach.

Acknowledgments

In this study, I greatly benefited from numerous discussions with B. Pasquini during earlier joint work on the Wigner distributions and orbital angular momentum. I am also particularly grateful to A. Metz and L. Szymanowski for many helpful discussions. This work was supported by the P2I ("Physique des deux Infinis") network.

---

[1] C. Lorcé, arXiv:1205.6483 [hep-ph].

[2] X. -S. Chen, X. -F. Lu, W. -M. Sun, F. Wang and T. Goldman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 232002 (2008).

[3] X. -S. Chen, W. -M. Sun, F. Wang and T. Goldman, Phys. Rev. D **83**, 071901 (2011).

[4] M. Wakamatsu, Phys. Rev. D **81**, 114010 (2010).

[5] M. Wakamatsu, Phys. Rev. D **83**, 014012 (2011).

[6] S. V. Ivanov, G. P. Korchemsky and A. V. Radyushkin, Yad. Fiz. **44**, 230 (1986) [Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **44**, 145 (1986)].

[7] V. I. Shevchenko and Y. A. Simonov, Phys. Lett. B **437**, 146 (1998).

[8] X. -D. Ji, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 610 (1997).

[9] R. L. Jaffe and A. Manohar, Nucl. Phys. B **337**, 509 (1990).

[10] X. Ji, X. Xiong and F. Yuan, arXiv:1202.2843 [hep-ph].

[11] X. Ji, X. Xiong and F. Yuan, arXiv:1207.5221 [hep-ph].

[12] X. Ji, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 062001 (2003).

[13] A. V. Belitsky, X. Ji and F. Yuan, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 074014 (2004).

[14] C. Lorcé and B. Pasquini, Phys. Rev. D **84**, 014015 (2011).

[15] C. Lorcé, B. Pasquini, X. Xiong and F. Yuan, Phys. Rev. D **85**, 114006 (2012).

[16] Y. Hatta, Phys. Rev. D **84**, 041701 (2011).

[17] Y. Hatta, Phys. Lett. B **708**, 186 (2012).

[18] S. Bashinsky and R. L. Jaffe, Nucl. Phys. B **536**, 303 (1998).

[19] Y. Hatta and S. Yoshida, arXiv:1207.5332 [hep-ph].

[20] S. Meissner, A. Metz and M. Schlegel, JHEP **0908**, 056 (2009);

[21] M. G. A. Buffing and P. J. Mulders, JHEP **1107**, 065 (2011).

[22] M. G. A. Buffing, A. Mukherjee and P. J. Mulders, arXiv:1207.3221 [hep-ph].